DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 010 RC 012 951

AUTHOR	Twitchell, Wirt B.
TITLE	Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program: Evaluation and Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Northern Arizona Univ., Flagstaff.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Indian Affairs (Dept. of Interior), Washington, D.C. Div. of Exceptional Education.
PUB DATE	23 Jul 81
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indian Education; American Indians; *Disabilities; Educational Objectives; Elementary Education; *Individualized Education Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Content; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Residential Programs; Special Education; *Special Programs; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Arizona (Chinle); *Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program; Navajo (Nation)

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of the 5-week Chinle Agency (Bureau of Indian Affairs) Summer Special Education Program for participating elementary teachers reflected the strengths and weaknesses of the program, which served 43 eligible Navajo students and classroom teachers and teacher aides for some length of time, and presented 20 recommendations. Evaluation methodology involved on-site observations, compilation and interpretation of formal instruments, personal interviews, qualitative judgements based on formal program goals and objectives, and a sequential series of pre-test/post-test examinations designed to measure both participant growth and performance capabilities. Highlights of the program were the writing/development of an Individualized Education Program for each handicapped child, and daily in-service training and experiential projects for staff and teachers. Primary strengths of the program were consistency (ability to work with students on a regular basis), flexibility/adaptability, good communication, accessibility, opportunities for informal evaluation and feedback, development and maintenance of one-to-one student-teacher relationships, and staff commitment to the program. Identified weaknesses included initial confusion over external administrative interference, unusually large class size (12-16 students), and a need for enhanced coordination of total program functions and better early preparation/planning. Instruments used in the evaluation are appended. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209010

Evaluation and Final Report

Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program

RC 012951

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wm. Twitchell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Northern Arizona University · FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA 86011

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
BOX 4122 • PHONE (602) 523-6231

July 23, 1981

Dr. Charles Cordova
Division of Exceptional Education
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Mail Code 507
18 N.C. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Dr. Cordova:

The attached evaluation of the Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program reflects a comprehensive investigation of the entire five week sequence and if offered without sanction.

This report delineates both strong and weak points of the program and the associated recommendations are purely subjective in nature and do not take into consideration any form of budgetary contraint.

I trust you will find this report satisfactory and I look forward to working with you and the Bureau on future projects.

Sincerely,

Wirt Twitchell

Wirt B. Twitchell
Program Evaluator

WBT/nh

Table of Contents

Rational/Introduction

Program Description

Evaluation

Recommendations

Attachment A - Statistical Data

Attachment B - Program Forms

Attachment C - The 94-142 Program

Rationale/Introduction

Living in the present, we are prone to look to the past for the experience to guide us in shaping a new and more satisfying future. But the real hope of the future often lies in ventures which break out of the past and apply new tools to solve our problems.

In 1975 the Congress set a goal that by September 1, 1978, all of the nations handicapped children age 3 to 18 would have available a free appropriate public education which meets their unique needs. This goal probably will not be achieved until at least the mid 1980's. Recent GAO reviews of selected state programs disclosed major problems in program operations and educational opportunities for handicapped children.

The Chinle Agency program reflects an effort on the part of a group of individuals committed to enhanced service delivery to special needs children, to expand educational programming beyond a status quo mentality. Unyielding support and encouragement on the part of Agency administrators greatly facilitated the overall process and provided the impetus for innovative programming techniques necessary for unique educational development.

Summer programming for special education within the Agency is/has been the exception rather than the rule. The identified and broadly acknowledged success of the Chinle program should encourage further investigation into this and similar models.

Program Description

The Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program was established and formulated during FY 1980-81 to provide a much needed programmatic addition to BIA Special Education within the participating elementary schools of the Chinle Agency. The provision of supplemental academic, recreational, and residential experiences was perceived as a beneficial and highly cost effective manner to expand both the intellectual and environmental exposure of identified students involved in the formal education process.

Based on a previous review and evaluation of Agency Special Education programs at the individual schools, it was concluded that students would benefit most from a relatively short term but intensive involvement in activities directly related to in-school experiences, i.e.- individualized and small group learning skills development, gross and fine motor skills development exercises, speech therapy where applicable, group residential experiences, etc.

The model for this program, directly attributable to Dr. Carl Foster, was based on the utilization of as many existing staff and services as possible while minimizing identified deficiencies. In essence, the Summer Program took advantage of the existing strong points of Agency programming and provided direction and training in new and innovative programming techniques. The staff and faculty involved in the program were exposed to daily in-service training modules relative to curricula and service delivery, and participated in a breadth of hands-on experiential projects.

Primary emphasis of this Summer program was placed on developing skills applicable to future teaching responsibilities in the individual schools and expanding and refining existing skills to more adequately serve the students while ensuring federal compliance as mandated by P.L. 94-142.

The most important tool in helping schools achieve P.L. 94-142's goal of a free appropriate public education for each handicapped child is the Individualized Education Program (IEP). Program regulations required that an IEP must be completed for each handicapped child receiving special education. Again based on previously identified deficiencies, special program emphasis was undertaken to reduce discrepancies and assure that each staff member, whether teacher or aide was aware of the content, specified intent, and applicability of the IEP document.

IEP's are defined as a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specifically designed instruction to meet the needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child. IEP's are further required to contain the following five items of information:

(A) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of each child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, (C) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to each child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in

regular educational programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and (E) appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved. Appropriate documentation, including IEP, is required to be in effect for each handicapped child receiving special education from the agency at the initiation of said services, and must be in effect before special education services are provided to a child.

Due to the importance placed on development of comprehensive, appropriate, and achievable IEP's for the students, a great deal of program time was expended both on the writing/development of the IEP and on quantifying the results. Compilation of data over the course of the five week program was also requisite for the teachers and aides to allow them the viable opportunity tc evaluate each childs progress and write a final report relative to individual successes, failures, and negated goals and objectives. The entire process involved realistic applications but the condensed time frame allowed for a more finite and exacting approach to the classroom experience.

One of the more innovative components was the coordination of academic goals with recreational goals. By incorporating a separate series of IEP's for the participants, that is, developing a sequentially delineated IEP document to address the totality of the student's needs, the program was designed to provide each child with 24 hour programming. Hypothetically, multiple IEP's

would be written for each child, thus ensuring a complete spectrum of viable service delivery while maintaining a coordinated staff effort relative to consistency and parity.

A major application of the above stated tenet that proved to be highly beneficial to both participants and staff was the inclusion of a Speech Therapist as a member of the program staff. Additionally, an aide was employed to work in conjunction with the S.T. to provide expanded service and to facilitate bilingual and/or Navajo speaking students. This staff application served two major purposes: (1) students were exposed to additional therapy sessions during a time frame that normally would not be condusive to same, and (2) to a greater extent than is normally possible, the S.T. was able to work with both staff and students during class time and thus was able to take advantage of practical applications, i.e.- exercises, and the teachers/aides were able to view S.T. methodology and receive supplemental instruction on methods they could use in a paraprofessional capacity to assist students with their therapy applications.

Another major program component involved the use of outside consultants to provide in-service training for the total instructional staff in topical areas identified as high priority items, i.e.- behavior management techniques, EH-LD curriculum, physical therapy, and psychometric instruments and interpretation. Additionally, the program administrative staff offered in-service training on topics identified by the staff as areas of interest or areas in which staff were deficient and/or underprepared.

This entire process was instituted to encourage a total learning environment for the program. Everyone, staff and students alike, was involved in the formal education process. Each phase was evaluated by the staff and workshop content and format was scrutinized relative to practical applications rather than theoretical extrapolation.

Staff members who chose to do so were enrolled in internship/independent study courses offered under the auspices of Utah State University and the Exceptional Child Center. This option provided the staff with the opportunity to enhance their educational standing within the Agency framework and also provided program administration with an additional mechanism to evaluate performance. Generally, the incentive to perform academically as well as programmatically was felt to be the more productive and optimal alternative due to the intellectual as well as the professional/career assiduity.

The premise behind the Summer Program was not founded on intrusion or purely negative criticism of the existing service delivery system. The methods and standards utilized are of little consequence in this matter, and the inclusion of purely critical data is not intended as an incentive to alter and/or adapt existing programming. The impact of such an attempt would only serve to evanesce contributory input, a matter that cannot be downplayed or ignored in importance. The primary rationale for the institution of this program was to establish and/or identify priorities for improvement or adaptation and determine qualitative

standards of effectiveness. At the root of the entire procedure was the clarification of federal and Agency objectives and the prioritization of goals in relation to the tenets of P.L. 94-142.

Special Education efforts are not new in American education. The problems associated with redemption are new, however, and certainly pose more complexity to educators than ever before; no longer can redemption be viewed simply as a special problem situation. Improvement in methodology and curricula will not totally solve the problems of each exceptional student. Developmental programs must be holistic in design and implementation if the real student problems are to be addressed.

Given the formula for program explication, every effort needs to be made to ensure minimum standards are met and maintained. Guidelines are explicit and available and therefore, excuses for deficient programming components are not acceptable. Administrators and teachers hould be held accountable for their programs. They are the cornerstones of the system and competent performance should be demanded.

Special Education programming and service delivery at schools within the BIA Agency system must maintain compliance with the intent of P.L. 94-142. The degree of acquiescence to federal mandate may vary but each school must show the ability to maintain a compliant posture while making every effort to improve. The Chinle Agency Summer Special Education Program is the initial step in what may prove to be the wave of the future, an educational system that not only satisfied minimal competency standards but is self-sustaining in its efforts to grow and sophisticate.

Evaluation

The evaluation methodology for this program involved a series of on-sight observations, compilation and interpretation of formal instruments, personal interviews, qualitative judgements based on formal program goals and objectives, and a sequential series of pre-test/post-test examinations designed to measure both participant growth and performance capabilities.

Formal program instruments (see Attachment B) provided the basis for much of the quantifiable data and was compiled based on an assigned system of weighted categories and responses. Quantification proved to be inappropriate in some areas but generally proved to be adaptable to identified program requirement and priorities.

Six major evaluation components were built into the program in an attempt to provide a comprehensive overview of the summative parameters. The specific segments were as follows:

(1) Retention Rate.

Total number of students enrolled by the program compared to final roster. Additional information relative to this component was compiled as to reasons for non-participation, projected remedial action(s), methods for anticipating and controlling future rententive capabilities, etc.

(2) Staff Evaluation.

Staff performance was monitored and evaluated on a weekly basis to better determine individual strengths, weaknesses, ability to adapt, etc.

(3) Interview.

Attitudinal surveys were initiated relative to program objectives, techniques, methodology, and success. Program administrators were evaluated by the staff and appraised of their performance to allow for constructive change to take place. A great deal of subjective data was compiled and inferences drawn. Due to the informal nature in which the interviews were held, the data might prove to be biased but should not be considered totally invalid.

(4) Classroom Observation.

Each teacher and aide were observed at least weekly by the evaluator and daily by the program Director. Subjective inferences were drawn based on previously determined goals.

(5) Evaluation of Consultants.

All in-service training sessions were evaluated by the staff using a formal instrument. (Workshop Evaluation Form). Presentors were evaluated on knowledge, attitude, methodology, presentation capabilities, and overall rating. Workshop content and format was rated along with a general workshop rating. Staff comments relative to specific points were also sought.

(6) Program Evaluation.

The general impression of the total program based on the five previously outlined methods in conjunction with subjective criteria.

Program Staff

The staff selected to participate in this program, with one notable exception, were young and somewhat inexperienced. However, this youthful environment proved to be at least as beneficial as detrimental. Their willingness to adapt and learn new techniques, be innovative and creative in their methodological approaches, and their openness relative to constructive criticism served to bolster the pervading attitude of team building and conceptual tolerance.

Working relationships between teachers and aides developed into a major strength of the academic phase. In fact, the aides participated actively and openly from the inception of the program and produced an atmosphere of complete cooperation for the entire program staff. The input proffered by paraprofessional staff members actualized some of the more innovative programmatic changes particularly in the area of student-teacher relations, i.e.- IEP's were written and adapted based on ethno-cultural perspectives rather than a purely academic and/or psychometric assessment.

The level of professional preparation for all staff was good, certainly more than adequate, and familiarity with methodoligical approaches, teaching aids, requisite format, and Agency priorities was on a par with any organizational stipulations mandated for teachers employed on a regular contract basis. Overall, it can be stated that the quality of professional staff was good and every effort should be undertaken to maintain at least this years standard.

The Internship in Special Education form (see Attachment B) was utilized as a staff evaluation instrument. Ratings for instructional staff were as follows:

5.0 = Superior

Stephanie Popp	4.81 4.56	4.69
Maggie Leatherbury	4.92 4.48 4.10	4.50
Laura Tsosie	4.92 4.59 4.08	4.53
Adella Bull	4.80 4.58 3.70	4.37
Abbie Butler	4.83 4.67 4.12	4.54
Marie Begay	4.72 3.62	4.17
Phyliss Cosuse	4.10 2.71	3.41
Ernest Westmoreland	3.28 3.24 3.10	3.21
Robert Begay	4.60 3.52 3.18	3.77

Administration

Administrative participation relative to program activities occurred on three different levels and pertained to Agency participation, physical plant facilities, and programming.

The support and participation of Mr. Roland Kimbrough, Mr. Rupert Bailey, and Mr. Bill Mars, administrators at Chinle Boarding School, proved to be a major contributing factor in the success of the program. Cooperation was exemplary and access to requisite

materials and facilities was always facilitated with minimal interference.

Agency staff were generally supportive of program efforts and provided much needed assistance in securing budgetary clearances and processing paperwork essential to program activities. In general, external administrative factions proved to be flexible in their actions and their demands, maintained open and effective communication, and were accessible when programming warranted their input.

Program administration fell on the shoulders of three people during the initial stages of the program and on two people the remainder of the time. Dr. Carl Foster and Joyce Davis were active during the full term of the program and Emma Gabel of the Exceptional Child Center at Utah State University provided much needed guidance during the developmental stages. Dr. Foster proved to be the driving force behind the program from the very beginning and his willingness to serve in a diversity of roles allowed the other staff to concentrate on direct service delivery to the students without having to concern themselves with the bureaucratic turmoil that pervaded the early stages of program implementation.

The overwhelming success of this program is directly attributable to a number of 12-14 hour days commited unselfishly by Dr. Foster and Ms. Gable in developing and formulating programming that satisfied both federal and local priorities.

At all levels, the various administrative factions worked harmoniously and effectively. The atmosphere of goal directed

confunction at the administrative level ultimately facilitated program effectiveness at all levels.

Retention/Student Participation

A total of forty three (43) eligible students participated in the program for some length of time. Forty one (41) students were maintained throughout the program term. The retention rate of 95.35% is far and away more notable than any regular school year programming. Some problems with student transportation were encountered during the final week of the program but this is attributable to problems not related to the Summer curriculum.

Academic Program

Each of the three classroom teachers were required to develop and utilize an informal assessment instrument during the first two days of operation. This process facilitated and legitimized IEP development and also provided the instructional staff with a better understanding of student curricular needs. Due to early personnel problems that were unavoidable (one teacher became ill and was forced to withdraw from program participation), the first two weeks were marked by confusion as to actual class size but the staff proved to be resilient and adapted programming in accordance to student needs.

Classes were divided by age group and handicapping condition. Curriculum was developed by each teacher to suit both the needs of the students and the capabilities of each instructional group (teacher + aides(s)).

A pre-test/post-test sequence was implemented to measure and quantify student development and final reports were written for each student to reflect individual academic growth. These reports will be utilized for 1981-82 programming and should prove most beneficial in implementing future IEP's.

Recreational Program

All students were involved in recreationally based activities during half of each day to provide a well rounded and comprehensive sequence of programming. Primary emphasis was placed on the development of techniques designed to improve student fine and gross motor skills; and to encourage self expression, improve the self concepts, and expand academically related but supplemental artistic and behavioral modules. IEP's were written for each child and direct correlation between academic and recreational programs was maintained as closely as possible. Coordination with the residential components was also undertaken to the greatest extent possible.

The recreational program was extremely popular with the student population and allowed for a greater spectrum of interrelated programming to be implemented in a positive fashion.

In-Service Training/Consultants

Daily in-service training was utilized to expand the programmatic horizons of all staff members. Outside consultants were employed to provide topical expertise in the areas of curriculum and reading, legislative influences on special education, behavior management techniques, physical therapy, and

MR/LD programming. Staff associated with the Agency or intraprogram administration provided training in EH and P.L. 94-142, psychometric evaluation and interpretation, IEP development, instructional methodology, and speech therapy.

The I.P.R.R.C. Workshop Evaluation Form (see Attachment B) was utilized as an evaluation instrument. Ratings for consultants were as follows:

60.0 = Outstanding

Glen Casto Behavior Management	55.7
Janet Pratt MR/LD	52.875
Larry Isaac Legislation	51.77
Grace Benally Physical Therapy	51.5
Wilma Spencer Physical Therapy	51.5
Carl Foster EH and P.L. 94-142	51.0
Noreen McDonald Curriculum and Reading	50.8
Carl Foster Point System	49.625
Stephanie Popp Speech Therapy	48.0
Larry Isaac Legislation	47.16
Janet Pratt MR/LD	47.0
Noreen McDonald Curriculum and Reading	46.75

Ed Fallon Psychometry	45.7
Ed Fallon Psychometry	44.5

Program Evaluation

Primary strengths of this program were consistency, i.e.- ability to work with students on a regular basis, flexibility/ adaptability, open lines of communication, accessibility, opportunities for informal evaluation and feedback, i.e.- chances made available for change when applicable, development and maintenance of 1:1 student-teacher relationships and the overriding commitment of the entire instructional staff to the tenets of the program.

Identified weaknesses of the program were the initial confusion over external administrative interference, unusually large class size, i.e.- 12-16 students per class, need for enhanced coordination of total program functions, better early preparation/ planning needed to avoid excessive time commitment by administrators.

The above noted concerns were garnered from the staff over the course of the five week sequence. The total program experienced a feeling of developing comradship as the staff and administration worked through the various pitfalls they encountered over the course of program operation. The strength of the program can certainly be identified as the commitment to the program on the part of the entire staff. With few exceptions, the institution of a program of this nature on an annula basis would greatly benefit the entire special education population of the entire Agency.

Recommendations

The following changes are proffered in the interest of maximizing program effectiveness in future years.

(1) Administrative infighting needs to be reduced during the planning stages. Too many major program components were not ready for implementation due to internal political manuverings.

(2) Better screening procedures should be implemented when selecting sotential staff members. Attitudinal inventories should be utilized and greater input from teacher supervisors relative to effectiveness should be utilized.

(3) Comprehensive contingency plans should be developed to anticipate such problems as staff turnover, transportation problems, illness, etc.

(4) More complete coordination of staff and programming of academic, recreational, and residential components.

(5) Better student-adult ratio. 10 EH students - 1 teacher/2 aides. 10 students - 1 teacher/1 aide. All other student populations.

(6) Ensure each classroom maintain a single handicapping condition population.

(7) Attempt to enlist greater parent involvement.

(8) Increase staff to reflect the following: Behavior Management Spec. Physical Therapist.

(9) Expand speech/hearing role to include testing and examination procedures.

(10) Allow for more free time during post-academic hours for teachers.

(11) Examine the feasibility of late Summer programming as a lead in to regular year enrollment.

(12) Encourage and facilitate an open atmosphere that is condusive to free exchange of ideas at all levels and between the entire staff.

(13) Arrange for the instructional staff to have meetings as a group to discuss problems and strategies for change.

(14) Reduce paperwork related problems for staff. Ensure that student records are complete and functional prior to program enrollment.

(15) Complete in-service training not directly related to classroom experiences/methodology during the first week and/or before the students arrive.

(16) Clarify each staff members responsibilities and maintain consistency.

(17) Reduce the program structure during those times not directly related to student service delivery.

(18) Incorporate the residential staff into the total programming picture.

(19) Avoid hypothetical/theoretical situations during in-service, stress practical application.

(20) Stress self-reliance among the staff relative to problem solving. There was too great a willingness on the part of administrators to be involved at all levels. Allow and encourage personal growth.

Attachment A

Overall Rating of Workshops

(In-Service Training Evaluation)

Outstanding	48	37.5%
Better than Average	53	41.4%
Average	27	21.0%
Below Average	0	-0-
Poor	0	-0-
	128 responses	100.0%

Performance of Director

(Evaluation by Total Staff)

4.0 = Outstanding

3.36
3.73
2.73
3.09
4.0
2.8
3.09
1.55
2.78
3.0
2.5
3.0
3.36

3.03 Overall Rating by Staff

Attachment B

I. E. P. Academic_____ Intern_____ Primary _____ E.H._____

Behavioral_____ Student_____ Intermediate_____ L.D._____

Assessment-Informal	Academic/Behavioral	Objectives	Methods & Materials	Outcome	Date

INTERNSHIP IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

INTERN _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

LAST FIRST MIDDLE | SOC. SEC. NUMBER | DATE | EVALUATOR

_____ _____ _____

LESSON EVALUATION (TYPE OF) | MID-TERM EVALUATION | SELF-EVALUATION

_____ _____ _____

PROJECT DIRECTOR | UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR | FINAL EVALUATION

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL RELEVANT ITEMS IN EACH CATEGORY. THE INTERN SHOULD BE RATED IN RELATION TO OTHER INTERNS, NOT IN RELATION TO EXPERIENCED TEACHERS. DESCRIPTIVE COMMENTS ARE ENCOURAGED.

A. INTEREST AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS. THE INTERN:	SUPERIOR	GOOD	AVG.	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY	COMMENT
1. SHOWS AN HONEST LIKING AND SINCERE REGARD FOR STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
2. IS WILLING TO SPEND EXTRA TIME TO HELP STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
3. IS RESPONSIVE AND COURTEOUS TO STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
4. CAN RELATE WITH STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SOCIOECONOMIC AND ETHNIC GROUPS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
5. HELPS STUDENTS TO UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT OWN ABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
6. TRIES TO GET "TO KNOW" STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
B. MANAGEMENT OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR: THE INTERN:							
1. USES POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT FOR DESIRED BEHAVIOR	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

B. MANAGEMENT OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR (CONTINUED)	SUPERIOR	GOOD	AVG.	FAIR	POOR	NOT APPLY	COMMENTS
8. USES VARIETY OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
9. IS CONSISTENT AND FAIR WITH STANDARDS OF INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
10. ELICITS MUTUAL RESPECT FOR RIGHTS & OPINIONS OF STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
11. GAINS AND KEEPS GROUP ATTENTION DURING DIFFERENT TYPES OF LEARNING EXPERIENCES	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
12. IS ABLE TO TAKE INITIATIVE AND MAKE GOOD DECISIONS WHEN PROBLEMS ARISE	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
WITHIN GROUP INSTRUCTION:							
13. CONTROL CONDUCTIVE TO LEARNING	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
14. ABLE TO KEEP STUDENT SITTING PROPERLY IN CHAIR, STAYING ON TARGET WITH TASK.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
15. CHILD PLACED AROUND TABLE OR AREA FOR MAXIMUM SUCCESS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
16. POSITIVE TACTICS USE TO BRING CHILD BACK TO GROUP	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
17. ASSIGNMENTS GIVEN ARE REASONABLE AND WITHIN LIMITS OF STUDENT ABILITIES	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
18. ACTUAL 'TEACHING' TAKING PLACE, "NOT JUST WALKING STUDENTS THROUGH LESSON"	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
19. INSTRUCTIONS ARE CLEAR AND UNDERSTOOD BY STUDENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
20. IS ABLE TO MAINTAIN GROUP WHILE BEING 'TUNED IN' TO KIDS AT THEIR DESKS AND INSURING THAT THE 'FLOOR' IS RUNNING SMOOTHLY	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

	Superior	Good	Avg.	Fair	Poor	Not Apply	Comment
Transitions							
21. Changing from one subject to another is smooth	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
22. Does not leave class hanging	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
23. Keeps eye on clock in order to keep class running on schedule	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
24. Is aware of classroom routine and what comes next	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
C. Preparation - The Intern:							
25. Plans activities and lesson which reflect imagination and creativity	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
26. Prepares appropriate and well organized lesson plans	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
27. Shows evidence of being well informed on subject matter	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
28. Has understanding of sequential order to teaching the subject	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
29. Is familiar with objectives of lesson to teach spontaneously and with enthusiasm	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
30. Makes daily adjustments to lesson plans to provide needed continuity	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
31. Shows creativity in providing interest & learning centers	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
D. Instructional Materials The Intern:							
32. Encourages students to bring appropriate materials to class	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
33. Plans ahead to have all materials and equipment ready for next subject	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
E. Lesson Presentation The Intern:							
34. Lesson is clear and concise	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
35. Demonstrates confidence	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

E. Lesson Presentation (continued)	Superior	Good	Avg.	Fair	Poor	Not Apply	Comment
36. Keeps lesson appropriate to objectives	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
37. Presents lesson with interest and enthusiasm	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
38. Attempts varied teaching methods	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
F. Evaluation of Student Achievement The Intern:							
39. Carries on continuous evaluation of student progress (informal, charting, anecdotal)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
40. Is able to use test instruments to identify learning difficulties	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
41. Places emphasis upon learning rather than grades	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
G. Reliability - The Intern:							
42. Is punctual for work assignments appointments and conferences	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
43. Can be depended upon to carry out assigned duties	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
44. Demonstrates awareness of regular school procedures	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
H. Staff Relationships The Intern:							
45. Shows consideration and respect for fellow staff members	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
46. Demonstrates ethical and professional behavior	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
47. Is cooperative	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
48. Favorable responds to advice and/or criticism	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

36

37

I. EMOTIONAL & PHYSICAL QUALITIES THE INTERN:	SUPERIOR	GOOD	AVG.	FAIR	POOR	NOT APPLY	COMMENT
49. DEMONSTRATES COMPOSURE AND SELF DISCIPLINE	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
50. USES APPROPRIATE VOICE FOR THE SITUATION	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
51. HAS APPROPRIATE DRESS AND GROOMING	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
52. AVOIDS DISTRACTING MANNERS	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

INTERN SIGNATURE

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

N.A.U. SUPERVISOR

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

Special Education Summer School

Report of Pupil Progress

Date: _____

Student:

Date of Birth:

Age:

Placement:

Intern:

Statement of Goals and Objectives:

Reading:

Math:

Statement of Goals:

Behavior:

Summary:

Graduate Intern's Signature / Date

Summer School Director's Signature / Date

Supervisor's Signature / Date

cc: School
Parent

The list below describes 10 responsibilities which some program administrators pursue. In column 1, circle the number corresponding to your judgement of how important each of these should be for your administrator using the following code:

1 - Not Important

2 - Fairly Important

3 - Quite Important

4 - Essential

Use column 2 to describe how effectively you feel your program administrator fulfilled each responsibility during the past weeks. Omit any item if you feel you cannot make a valid judgement.

1 - Poor

2 - In Between

3 - Good

4 - Outstanding

IMPORTANCE Column 1		RESPONSIBILITIES	PERFORMANCE Column 2
1 2 3 4	(1)	Guides the development of staff in relation to program needs and priorities.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(2)	Recognizes staff in accordance with their contribution to the program.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(3)	Guides development of sound organizational plan to accomplish program objectives.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(4)	Effective and equitable in allocation of staff responsibilities.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(5)	Fosters effective teaching	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(6)	Stimulates and encourages staff input.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(7)	Understands and communicates the objectives and specific goals of the program.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(8)	Communicates openly and effectively with staff.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(9)	Facilitates both internal and external communication in relation to the program.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(10)	Strives to improve and enhance program image.	1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4	(11)	Follows through on staff suggestions.	1 2 3 4

Indicate how frequently each of the following 30 statements is descriptive of this program staff member by circling the number corresponding to your judgement.

1 - Hardly ever (not at all descriptive)

2 - Less than half the time

3 - About half the time

4 - More than half the time

5 - Almost always (very descriptive)

This staff member:

(12)	Makes own attitudes clear to staff.	1 2 3 4 5
(13)	Works without a plan.	1 2 3 4 5
(14)	Maintains definite standards of performance.	1 2 3 4 5
(15)	Makes sure his/her part in the department is understood by all staff members.	1 2 3 4 5
(16)	Lets staff members know what's expected of them.	1 2 3 4 5
(17)	Sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity.	1 2 3 4 5
(18)	Sees to it that the work of the staff is coordinated.	1 2 3 4 5
(19)	Does little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the program staff.	1 2 3 4 5
(20)	Is easy to understand.	1 2 3 4 5
(21)	Keeps to him/herself.	1 2 3 4 5
(22)	Is concerned for the personal welfare of individual staff members.	1 2 3 4 5
(23)	Refuses to explain actions.	1 2 3 4 5

(24)	Acts without consulting the staff.	1 2 3 4 5
(25)	Is slow to accept new ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
(26)	Treats all staff members as his/her equal.	1 2 3 4 5
(27)	Is willing to make changes	1 2 3 4 5
(28)	Makes staff members feel at ease when talking to them.	1 2 3 4 5
(29)	Puts staff suggestions into action.	1 2 3 4 5
(30)	Gets staff approval on important matters before going ahead.	1 2 3 4 5
(31)	Postpones decisions unnecessarily.	1 2 3 4 5
(32)	Is more a reactor than initiater.	1 2 3 4 5
(33)	Makes it clear that staff suggestions for improving the program are welcome.	1 2 3 4 5
(34)	Is responsive to one "clique" in the staff but largely ignores those who are not members of the clique.	1 2 3 4 5
(35)	In expectations of staff members, makes allowance for their personal or situational problems.	1 2 3 4 5
(36)	Lets staff members know when they've done a good job.	1 2 3 4 5
(37)	Explains the basis for his/her decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
(38)	Gains input from staff on important matters.	1 2 3 4 5

(39) Acts as though the visible program accomplishments are important to him/her. 1 2 3 4 5

(40) Acts as though high staff morale is important to him/her. 1 2 3 4 5

(41) Tries out new ideas with the staff. 1 2 3 4 5

The following questions ask about yourself or the program in general. Use this answer code:

1 - Definitely False

2 - More False Than True

3 - In Between

4 - More True Than False

5 - Definitely True

(42) I enjoy my work in this program. 1 2 3 4 5

(43) I have a positive relationship with my immediate supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5

(44) I agree with the priorities and emphasis which have guided recent program development. 1 2 3 4 5

(45) The program has been getting stronger in recent weeks (use responses 1 or 2 if it has been getting weaker, use response 3 if there has been little change). 1 2 3 4 5

During recent times, the program's effectiveness has been impaired by:

(46)	Inadequate Facilities.	1 2 3 4 5
(47)	Bureaucratic requirements and regulations.	1 2 3 4 5
(48)	Inadequate financial resources.	1 2 3 4 5
(49)	A relatively low priority given to the program by Agency Administration.	1 2 3 4 5
(50)	Obstructionism/negativism from one or more staff members. Specify name(s) and examples if possible.	1 2 3 4 5

Please be as candid and honest as possible when answering these questions.

What matters need priority attention in the program during the coming weeks?

Identify any/all program policies or procedures which you feel need immediate improvement.

Identify the program administrators strong points.

1.

2.

Identify his/her weak points.

1.

2.

Attachment C

THE 94-142 PROGRAM

On November 29, 1975, the Congress enacted Public Law 94-142 to (1) assure that all handicapped children have available a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services to meet their unique needs, (2) assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, (3) assist States and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and (4) assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children.

The act requires that a "free appropriate public education" be available for all handicapped children age 3 to 18 by September 1, 1978, and age 3 to 21 by September 1, 1980, except for children age 3 to 5 and 18 to 21 in States where the requirement is inconsistent with State law or practice or a court order. The act also specifies a number of activities that schools must engage in to ensure that handicapped children receive the rights they have been guaranteed. It requires that specialists evaluate the children's special needs and determine the most appropriate educational environment for these children; that an individualized education program (IEP) be developed for each child identified as needing special

---

1/"Federal Direction Needed for Educating Handicapped Children in State Schools" (HRD-78-6, Mar. 16, 1978).

The following chart shows Federal funding since the first year of program implementation:

Fiscal year	Amount appropriated (millions)	Amount per handicapped child
1977	$315	$ 72
1978	465	156
1979	804	211
1980	874	227
1981	a/922	239 (est.)

a/Amount requested by the Department of Education.

Initially, the allocation of 94-142 funds to the States was based on the average of two separate State counts of handicapped children--one conducted on October 1 and the other on February 1 of the prior school year. On November 1, 1978, the Congress enacted Public Law 95-561 (92 Stat. 2364) to permit States to count their children only once each year, on December 1. OSE statistics show the following numbers of handicapped children counted and served under the 94-142 program:

Date	Childcount
Oct. 1, 1976	3,382,495
Feb. 1, 1977	3,613,550
Oct. 1, 1977	3,424,217
Feb. 1, 1978	3,684,167
Dec. 1, 1978	3,716,073
Dec. 1, 1979	3,802,511

In addition, more than 200,000 handicapped children were counted each year in State operated or supported schools under the 89-313 program, bringing the total count of children served to over 3.9 million in fiscal year 1979. 1/ The children served by these two programs fell predominantly into three categories--speech impaired, learning disabled, and mentally retarded. Lesser numbers of children were classified as emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf or hard of hearing, visually handicapped, or other health impaired.

1/4.0 million in fiscal year 1980.

The States we reviewed were selected to provide a cross-section of large and small populations, relatively high and low per-capita State and local funding levels, older and newer State handicapped laws, approved and not yet approved State handicapped plans, and geographic distribution. LEAs were selected on the basis of their geographic location and size. Neither the States nor the LEAs were selected because their programs were considered better or worse than others. Also, because the focus of our review was on identifying ways in which the Federal Government and the States can assist LEAs rather than on identifying specific problems at individual locations, we generally have not identified LEAs by name.

Our review included discussions with appropriate management, teaching, and other personnel at the Federal, State, LEA, and school levels and examinations of legislation, regulations, State plans, district and school records (including children's individual education folders), and other reports, files, and documents related to the program. We also toured school facilities, visited classes, and observed school activities. We did not attempt to evaluate overall quality of education provided at any school, nor did we routinely discuss the programs with participating children or their parents.

Also, because most of the statistics on enrollments, counts, and other data we obtained were generated by many different Federal, State, and local agency computers, we could not readily evaluate the functioning of the automatic data processing systems to assess the reliability and precision of the computer-generated data.

In June 1980 we requested comments on our draft report from the Department of Education and the 10 States included in our review. Replies were received from the Department and from Florida, South Dakota, and Texas. State officials' comments were considered in preparing this report and are recognized, where appropriate, in the report. The Department's response is included as appendix II.

Fiscal year appropriation	For use in fiscal year	Authorized percent of NAPPE
1977	1978	5
1978	1979	10
1979	1980	20
1980	1981	30
1981	1982	40

The law also provides that grants to all States are to be reduced proportionately if funds appropriated are less than funds authorized. In determining the amount of funds allocated to each State, no more than 12 percent of the number of children in each State, age 5 to 17, may be counted as handicapped. Legislation places priority on identifying and serving first the unserved handicapped children, and second the most severely handicapped within each disability category who are receiving an inadequate education.

Any State meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in the law and wishing to participate must submit to OSE each year a State plan which assures that (1) funds will be spent in accordance with the provisions of the law, (2) funds provided under other Federal programs for educating handicapped children will be used in a manner consistent with the goal of providing a free appropriate public education, (3) programs and procedures for personnel development will be established, (4) provision will be made for the participation of handicapped children in private schools and facilities, and (5) Federal funds will be used to supplement State and local expenditures. Of the total funds that a State receives, only 5 percent or $300,000, 1/ whichever is greater, may be used by States for administrative costs.

Under the act, 75 percent of a State's 94-142 grant is to "flow through" the State education agency (SEA) to the LEAs that meet legislated requirements and priorities and that are able to qualify for a minimum allocation of $7,500. Funds which a State retains must be matched on a program-by-program basis from non-Federal sources if the funds are used for other than administrative purposes.

1/Increased from $200,000 by Public Law 96-270 (94 Stat. 487), enacted on June 14, 1980.